

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/581,535	STEUNENBERG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	BHARAT C. PATEL	3724

All Participants:

(1) BHARAT C. PATEL

Status of Application: Allowance

(3) Gregory L. Thorne.

(2) Ghassem Aie.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6 May 2010

Time: 1 PM

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Previous non-final rejection with respect to 112nd second para, and the amendment.

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

Hawes (2006/0037197) and Schmitz (6138364)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The submitted amendment does not overcome the 112nd second para rejection, and can be read on the Schmitz. Applicant authorized Examiner's amendment to amend the claim 1 so that the amendment overcomes the rejection of the prior art of the record. The proposal was discussed to clarify the mounting method of the cutting member.

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)